DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 346 788 HE 025 606

AUTHOR Rubino, Antonio Nicholas
TITLE Student Satisfaction with the Educational Leadership Program at Western Michigan University.
PUB DATE 8 May 92
NOTE 28p.; Paper presented at the Educational Leadership Research Encounter (Kalamazoo, MI, March, 1992).
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Education; *Doctoral Programs; Educational Administration; Graduate School Faculty; *Graduate Students; Graduate Study; Graduate Surveys; Higher Education; *Participant Satisfaction; Program Evaluation; *Student Attitudes; Student Evaluation of Teacher Performance; Teacher Educator Education
IDENTIFIERS *Educational Leadership; *Western Michigan University

ABSTRACT

A study was done to determine the relationship between student satisfaction with the Educational Leadership department graduate study program at Western Michigan University, and the time the students had been in the program. The study used a Student Satisfaction Scale that measured faculty characteristics, student participation in the program, instruction, students' relationship, department services, and program curriculum. The data were collected from 81 students enrolled in the masters and doctoral degree programs of the department since winter 1990. Based on the results of the study, a relationship between the length of time a student had attended the graduate program in educational leadership and satisfaction with the program was not found. A relationship was found between students' satisfaction with the instruction and the length of time attending the program. Those students with more time in the program felt more satisfied with the instructional process than those who had spent less time. Included in three appendixes are faculty comments on the survey instrument, observations made by the paper's editor, and a copy of the survey. There are 11 references. (Author/JB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

STUDENT SATISFACTION WITH THE EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP PROGRAM AT WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY

ED346788

Paper presented to
1992 Educational Leadership Research Encounter

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Antonio Rubino

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Antonio Nicolas Rubino
Doctoral Candidate
Department of Educational Leadership
Western Michigan University
May 8, 1992

HE 025 606

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Student satisfaction with the Educational Leadership program at Western Michigan University

Antonio N. Rubino

Western Michigan University

March, 1992

Abstract

This study was conducted to determine the relationship between student satisfaction with the Educational Leadership department program at WMU, and the time the students has been in the program.

The Student Satisfaction Scale (SSS) was created by the author. Its face validity was appraised by four faculty members of the Educational Leadership department. The SSS' reliability coefficient was .9. The scale was desegregated in six factors: faculty characteristics, student participation in the program, instruction, students relationship, department services, and program curriculum. The scores of the scale were used to determine the degree of student satisfaction. Time in the program was measured by the number of semesters the student has in the program.

The data were collected from 81 students enrolled in the masters and doctoral degrees of the department since winter 1990. An analysis of the scores of the whole scale and of each factor was conducted using One Way Anova.

No relationship between time in the program and student satisfaction using the composite score, neither for each factor, except for instruction, was found.

Student satisfaction with the

Educational Leadership department

The knowledge of students' satisfaction with their program is very important to educators and school administrators. Educators and administrators may know the appropriateness of their work and the adequacy of the conduction of their institutions through students' satisfaction. Student satisfaction is a good indicator of the assessment of a study program, school, or educational department. In addition, changes in satisfaction through the time may provide hints to develop changes or reinforce behaviors.

Student satisfaction may be defined, based on Hoppock (1935), as the psychological, physiological and environmental conditions that make students satisfied with their universities,departments, or study programs. Students are satisfied when they feel that their performance is fairly rewarded (Miskel, Glasnapp and Hatley, 1974). Students will feel satisfied with a program if it meets their expectations.

Participation in the decision making process satisfies students when they have participate and exert personal control on the study program (Madden and Carli, 1982). Satisfaction and program structure are

commonly associated. Programs, where students have a low control on them, have been found more dissatisfying (Hill, 1981; Madden and Carli, 1982). Program design must be shared by teachers and students. Also, faculty respect and acceptance of student's opinions (Hill, 1981; Madden and Carli, 1982); social life, working conditions, compensation, recognition and quality of the education (Betz et al., 1969, 1970) are indicators associated with student satisfaction. Equally the perception of the school as a community is also explored as a source of student satisfaction (Hill, 1981; Pogue, 1977). Picciano (1980) found that the degree of satisfaction of college student depends on the academic experiences, and administrative services and facilities

Colleges and universities where faculty are accessible and keep close relationship with staff and student, produce greater satisfaction (Astin and Scherrei, 1980; Madden and Carli, 1982; Maryland University, 1986). If bidirectional communication takes places, satisfaction is increased.

Faculty advising and counseling, faculty concern for teaching, use of democratic style of teaching in the classroom, and procedures and appropriateness of

course evaluation relates to student satisfaction (Astin and Scherrei, 1980; Friday, 1990; Hill, 1981; Madden and Carli, 1982). However, McRae and Young (1988) did not found difference in students' satisfaction when the courses were taught with different methods.

Students' satisfaction is related to the time they stay in a program. The longer the time students spend in their programs the more satisfied they feel. Institutional involvement is reached through the length in the study program, communication with faculty, and clear expectations are institutional satisfiers.

Educational staff should know how the student satisfaction varies over time. They should use student satisfaction information to keep or adjust their work styles. Educational staff should ask themselves: How students' satisfaction relates to the time they remain in the educational program? The answer will provide the input to keep the organization as it is or to change it (Betz and others, 1970).

This study seeks to determine student's satisfaction, with EDLD programs (masters and doctor) its relationship with the length of students time on it.

Hypothesis

Students' satisfaction with the EDLD program will relate to the length of time they have attended it. Thus, when students have spent more time in the program, they feel more satisfaction.

Students' satisfaction will be described by elements such as: communication with faculty, participation in decision making, department social life, faculty-students relationship, students relationship, classroom conditions, instructional process, student program control, academic experiences, administrative services, structure of the program, faculty's communication of expectations, faculty accessibility and advising, faculty respect of students and their viewpoints, faculty concern for instruction, evaluation, rewards and achievement according to performance. Student's satisfaction will be measured by using the Student's Satisfaction Scale (SSS), which contains six factors: faculty characteristics, participation in the program design, instruction, students relationship, department services, and program curriculum.

The independent variable, students' length of time attending the EDLD program is divided up into two

categories (1) 1 to 3 semesters and (2) 4 or more semesters.

Method

Subjects: The sample consists of 81 voluntary students, 37% of the entire population, (38 males and 43 females), with ages between 20 and 51 years, enrolled in the master (60) and doctoral level (20), since winter 1990, in the human resources area (41), general area (32), research and evaluation (5), 3 students did not identify their concentration area.

Instruments: Student´s satisfaction was obtained using the 25 item Student Satisfaction Scale (SSS). All item scores were added to get the student´s satisfaction score whose maximum value is 125, and the minimum is 25. The SSS presented six factors: faculty characteristics, participation in the program, instruction, students relationship, department services, and program curriculum. Each item was based on the review of literature related to satisfaction in organizations. The SSS´s face validity was assessed by four faculty of the department of educational leadership (see appendix 1).

The adequacy of the language, the introduction and instructions were checked by an editor (see appendix

2). The final version of the scale is shown in appendix 3.

The reliability coefficient of SSS was determined using the Cronbach´s Coefficient Alpha. The reliability coefficient for the scale was .90. The coefficients for the factors were: .86 for faculty characteristics, .70 for participation in the program, .81 for instruction, .58 for students relationship, .78 for department services, and .76 for program curriculum. The reliability of the items rank between .48 and .73.

The SSS data, treated confidentially, were individually and anonymously collected from each subject of the sample. Students were informed to respond according to their satisfaction of the program.

Statistical procedure: The alternative hypothesis stating that at least one of the population means of satisfaction or of each factor regarding to the length of time in the EDLD program differs from each other, was tested against the null of no differences depending on the time in the EDLD program, using the One Way Anova test,with an alpha level of .05.

Analysis of the Findings

The summary of the One Way Anova is shown in the tables 1 to 8.

Table 1

Summary ANOVA for SSS in relation to length of time in the EDLD program

Source	df	MS	F ratio	F Prob.
Between group	1	564.2328	3.21	.07*
Within group	78	175.5994		
Total	79			

* p > .05

Table 2

Summary ANOVA for satisfaction with faculty in relation to length of time in the EDLD program

Source	df	MS	F ratio	F Prob.
Between group	1	72.7550	3.27	.07*
Within group	78	22.2204		
Total	79			

* p > .05

Table 3

Summary ANOVA for satisfaction with participation in the program in relation to length of time in the EDLD program

Source	df	MS	F ratio	F Prob.
Between group	1	.8126	.20	.65*
Within group	78	4.0369		
Total	79			

* p > .05

Table 4

Summary ANOVA for satisfaction with student relationships in relation to length of time in the EDLD program

Source	df	MS	F ratio	F Prob.
Between group	1	3.1447	.60	.43*
Within group	78	5.1648		
Total	79			

* p > .05

Table 5

Summary ANOVA for satisfaction with service in relation to length of time in the EDLD program

Source	df	MS	F ratio	F Prob.
Between group	1	.6510	.30	.58*
Within group	78	2.1517		
Total	79			

* p > .05

Table 6

Summary ANOVA for satisfaction with the curriculum in relation to length of time in the EDLD program

Source	df	MS	F ratio	F Prob.
Between group	1	2.1149	.82	.36*
Within group	78	2.5601		
Total	79			

* p > .05

Table 7

Summary ANOVA for satisfaction with instruction in relation to length of time in the EDLD program

Source	df	MS	F ratio	F Prob.
Between group	1	105.8410	5.06	.02*
Within group	78	20.8980		
Total	79			

* $p < .05$

Table 8.

Sample size, means, and standard deviations for instruction in relation to length of time in the EDLD program

Group	Count	M	SD
1-3 sem.	53	22.64	4.68
4-more sem.	27	25.07	4.34
Total	80	23.46	4.68

Cochrans test for homogeneity of variance was

higher than .5 in all the cases which implies that variances are homogeneous.

No relationship between time in the program and students' satisfaction with it was found for the SSS, and for satisfaction with: faculty, participation in the program, students relationship, department services, and program curriculum (F values > .05, tables 1 to 6). No difference was found between the total means of students' satisfaction scores and between the means of the scores of the factors in relation to the length of time in the EDLD program, except for the factor satisfaction with instruction (Fp = .02, p .05), difference was found regarding of those students with 1 to 3 semesters attending the EDLD program as compared with those who have attended 4 or more semesters; then, the hypothesis stating that students' satisfaction relates to the lenght of the time they have attended to the program is rejected for all factors, except for satisfaction with instruction. The students who have attended 4 semesters or more to the program feel more satisfied with the instruction provided on it.

Conclusions and Recommendations:

Based on the results of this study, a relationship

between the length of time a student has attended a graduate program of the Department of Educational Leadership, at Western Michigan University, and the satisfaction with such program was not found. Also, it may be stated that a relationship between the factors: faculty characteristics, participation in the program design, students relationships, department services, and program curriculum and the time in the program was not found.

There is a relationship between students' satisfaction with the instruction and the length of time attending the EDLD program. Those students with more time in the program feel more satisfied with the instructional process than those who have less time.

In synthesis, a relationship between time in the program and student satisfaction faculty, participation in the program design, students relationships, department services, and program curriculum was not found. Relationship was found between satisfaction with instruction and time attending to the program. It may be speculated that student satisfaction with instruction after attending some period of time (4 semesters or more) may be due to the use of more satisfying instructional strategies, or to the

conformity of the instructional strategies used by faculty in the department. These aspects and their causes may be adequate indicators for further investigation.

References

Astin, A. W., & Scherrei R. A. (1980). Maximizing leadership effectiveness. Impact of administrative style on faculty and students. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Inc.

Betz, E. L., Menne, J. W., & Starr, A. M. (1970). A dimensional analysis of college student satisfaction. Ames, IO: Iowa State University of Science and Technology. Student Counseling Services (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 041 954).

Friday, R. A. (1990). Faculty training: from group process to collaborative learning. Journal of Freshman Year Experience, 2(1), 49-67.

McRae, L. S., & Young, J. D. (1988). Student satisfaction in introductory business courses taught by lecture and discussion methods. Journal of Education for Business, 64(6), 252-255.

Hill, W. C. (1981). Student perceptions of advanced studies: a research to date summary. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 232 505).

Hoppock, R. (1935). Job satisfaction. New York: Harper.

Madden, M. E., & Carli, L. (1981). Students' satisfaction with graduate school and attributions of control and responsibility. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Eastern Psychological Association. New York. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No ED 211 866).

Maryland University. College Park. Division of Student Affairs. (1986). Understanding and increasing students' satisfaction with college. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No ED 296 670).

Miskel, C., Glassnapp, D., & Hatley, R. (1972). Public school teachers' work motivation, organizational incentives, job satisfaction, and primary life interests: final report. (Washington, DC; Office of education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare).

Picciano, A. G. (1980). Student satisfaction at the college of Staten Island: a study of june 1980 graduating students. Staten Island, NY: City University of New York, Staten Island College. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No ED 197 701).

Pogue, F. G. (1977). Graduate education in african and afro-american studies: an assessment at Suny in Albany. Western. Journal of Black Studies, 1(2), 87-92.

APPENDIX 1

APPENDIX 1

This appendix shown some of the comments and observations made by the educational leadership teachers that validated the scale. They made observations and corrections in the introduction. The observations were related to long of the introduction, instructions, and objectives of the scale. In the instructions section, the first instruction was divided in two. Instruction number 3 was reduced. In this instruction, the categories of the answers were highlighted by underlining them. Instructions 4 and 5 were slightly modified.

The following questions of the scale were modified: question 4, the word **activities** substituted the word **life**; questions 13 and 14, the words **in the department** were added; question 16, the word **courses** was added; question 21, the words **of the courses** were added; question 22, the words **and consulting** were eliminated; and question 25, the words **of study** were added. In the personal and academic section **number of months in the program** was changed by **length of time in the program**. In number 5, the category **doctor** was eliminated; and the questions 7 and 8 were added.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX 2

APPENDIX 2

This appendix shows the observations made by the editor. Some of the observations were: in instruction 3 set the categories between parenthesis at the end of each statement; make more clear the leading direction by adding **these areas involving**; add to question 24 **in no class settings**; in personal and academic section, ask in question 3 the **semester of program entry**, and add the category **other** to questions 6.

APPENDIX 3

STUDENT SATISFACTION SCALE

The Student Satisfaction Scale (SSS) is developed to determine the degree of students' satisfaction with their study program.

The primary reasons to investigate the students' satisfaction with a program are that (1) Satisfaction is a good indicator of the acceptation of a program, (2) it provides information about faculty actions, and (3) it can be used in your program improvement.

Your participation, in responding to this scale thoughtfully and honestly, is very important. Your responses are valuable. They will provide input to make study program decisions.

The SSS is anonymous and confidential. Its results will be reported by groups. No identification should be used, and you should not write your name.

I appreciate the time you will devote answering this scale.

Thanks.

INSTRUCTIONS

1. Read the leading direction of each section carefully.

2. Read each item carefully.

3. Indicate how satisfied you are with the proposition described in the item. Do not think too much about your answers, just respond how satisfied you feel. Do not respond how satisfied you think you should feel.

   If you feel very satisfied, circle the number 5, under VS (VERY SATISFIED).

   If you feel just satisfied, circle the number 4, under S (SATISFIED).

   If you cannot define the degree of satisfaction you feel, circle the number 3, under N (NEUTRAL).

   If you feel dissatisfied, circle the number 2, under D (DISSATISFIED).

   If you feel very dissatisfied, circle the number 1, under VD (VERY DISSATISFIED).

4. Circle only one number for each item.

5. Repeat this process for each item, and please, respond all the items.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

How satisfied are you with these areas involving:

	VS	S	N	D	VD
1. Communication with faculty.....	5	4	3	2	1
2. Decision making participation in the program.....	5	4	3	2	1
3. Decision making participation in classroom activities.....	5	4	3	2	1
4. Social activities in the department.....	5	4	3	2	1
5. Faculty-students relationships.....	5	4	3	2	1

How satisfied are you with these areas involving:

	VS	S	N	D	VD
6. Administrator-student relationships.....	5	4	3	2	1
7. Student-student relationships.....	5	4	3	2	1
8. Classroom conditions.....	5	4	3	2	1
9. Instruction quality.....	5	4	3	2	1
10. Student control of the program.....	5	4	3	2	1

How satisfied are you with these areas involving:

	VS	S	N	D	VD
11. Quantity of the academic experiences.....	5	4	3	2	1
12. Quality of the academic experiences.....	5	4	3	2	1
13. Administrative services in the department.....	5	4	3	2	1
14. Administrative facilities in the department.....	5	4	3	2	1
15. Structure of the program.....	5	4	3	2	1

How satisfied are you with these areas involving:

	VS	S	N	D	VD
16. Faculty communication of expectations.....	5	4	3	2	1
17. Faculty accessibility.....	5	4	3	2	1
18. Faculty respect of the students.....	5	4	3	2	1
19. Faculty acceptance of students' opinions.....	5	4	3	2	1
20. Faculty concern about the instruction.....	5	4	3	2	1

How satisfied are you with these areas involving:

	VS	S	N	D	VD
21. Student evaluation of the courses.....	5	4	3	2	1
22. Faculty advising.....	5	4	3	2	1
23. Achievement in relation to your performance.....	5	4	3	2	1
24. Application of learning in no class settings....	5	4	3	2	1
25. Evaluation of the program of study.....	5	4	3	2	1

PERSONAL AND ACADEMIC INFORMATION

Please answer the following questions about your personal and academic background by making an X and/or filling the appropriate space.

1. Sex: Male ( ) Female ( )

2. Age: 20 - 25 ( ) 26 - 30 ( ) 31 - 35 ( ) 36 - 40 ( )
   41 - 45 ( ) 45 - 50 ( ) over 51 ( )

3. Length of time in the program: please be the most accurate you can
   1 semester ( ) 2 semesters ( ) 3 semesters ( ) 4 semesters ( )
   5 semesters ( ) 6 semesters ( ) over 6 semesters ( )
   Please specify your semester of program entry:_____,____

4. Your area of concentration in the program:
   Human Resource development( ) Research and Evaluation ( )
   General Education ( )

5. Your highest degree level: Bachelor ( ) Master ( )

6. Your job background:
   Educational organizations ( ) Business organizations ( )
   Other ( ) especify:_____

7. Your number of credit hours completed:_____

8. Your average of credit hours per semester:_____

9. Your program level: Master ( ) Specialty ( ) Ph.D or Ed.D ( )